



APPROVED MAY 10, 2023

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
April 12, 2023 | Room 267

MINUTES

- MEMBERS PRESENT: Kim Parati (Chair)
Nichelle Hawkins (Vice Chair)
Chris Barth (2nd Vice-Chair)
Noelle Bell
Jill Walker
Sarah Wheat
Scott Whitlock
Heather Wojick
- MEMBERS ABSENT: Christa Lineberger
Phil Goodwin
Vacant (3)
- OTHERS PRESENT: Kristi Harpst, HDC Program Manager
Cindy Kochanek, HDC Staff
Jenny Shugart, HDC Staff
Candice Leite, HDC Staff
Marilyn Drath, HDC Staff
Nicole Hewett, Assistant City Attorney
Linda Keich, Clerk to the Board
Candy Thomas, Court Reporter

With a quorum present, Chair Parati called the April meeting of the Historic District Commission (Commission) meeting to order at 1:04 pm. Chair Parati began the meeting by introducing the Staff and Commissioners and explaining the meeting procedure. All interested parties planning to give testimony – FOR or AGAINST – must submit a form to speak and must be sworn in. Staff will present a description of each proposed project to the Commission. The Commissioners and the Applicants will then discuss the project. Audience members signed up to speak either FOR or AGAINST will be called to the podium for each agenda item. Presentations by the Applicants and audience members must be concise and focused on the **Charlotte Historic District Design Standards**. The Commission and Staff may question the Applicant. The Applicant may present sworn witnesses who will be subject to questioning by the Commission and Staff. The Applicant will be given an opportunity to respond to comments by interested parties. After hearing each application, the Commission will review, discuss, and consider the information that has been gathered and presented. During discussion and deliberation, only the Commission and Staff may speak. The Commission may vote to reopen this part of the meeting for questions, comments, or clarification. Once the review is completed, a MOTION will be made to Approve, Deny, or Continue the review of the application at a future meeting. A majority vote of the Commission members present is required for a decision to be reached. All exhibits remain with the Commission. If an Applicant feels there is a conflict of interest of any Commissioner, or there is an association that would be prejudicial, that should be revealed at the beginning of the hearing of a particular case. The Commission is quasi-judicial body and can accept only sworn

testimony. Staff will report any additional comments received and while the Commission will not specifically exclude hearsay evidence, it is only given limited weight. Chair Parati asked that everyone please silence any electronic devices. Commissioners are asked to announce, for the record, if one leaves or arrives during the meeting. Chair Parati requested that those in the audience remain quiet during the hearings. An audience member will be asked once to be quiet and the need for a second request will require removal from the room. Chair Parati swore in all Applicants and Staff and continued to swear in people as they arrived for the duration of the meeting. Appeals from the Historic District Commission are to the Zoning Board of Adjustment within thirty (30) days from the date of the decision to appeal. This is in accordance with Section 10.213 of the City Zoning Ordinance.

INDEX OF ADDRESSES:

NOT HEARD AT THE MARCH 8 MEETING

HDCMI-2022-00805, 1512-1514 SOUTHWOOD AV WILMORE

CONSENT

HDCMI-2023-00254, 1512 THOMAS AV PLAZA MIDWOOD

CONTINUED FROM MARCH 8 MEETING

HDCMA-2022-01041, 1900 DILWORTH RD W. DILWORTH
HDCMI-2022-01006, 500 E. PARK AV DIWORTH

NEW CASES

HDCMA-2022-01127, 828 E. WORTHINGTON AV DILWORTH
HDCMI-2022-01156, 621 BERKELEY AV DILWORTH
HDCMI-2022-01154, 1706 DILWORTH RD E. DILWORTH
HDCMIA-2022-01148, 1921 RUSSELL AV OAKLAWN PARK
HDCMAA-2023-00061, 700 TEMPLETON AV DILWORTH
HDCMIA-2022-01157, 317 WESTWOOD AV WILMORE
HDCMI-2023-00113, 1119 BELGRAVE PL DILWORTH
HDCMIA-2023-00075, 1513-1515 S. MINT ST WILMORE
HDCMA-2023-00074, 1500 DILWORTH RD DILWORTH
HDCMA-2023-00115, 1921 CHARLOTTE DR DILWORTH
HDCRDEMO-2023-00079, 1209 MYRTLE AV DILWORTH

Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the updates about the UDO alignment and McCrorey Heights in the Design Standards, and it was seconded by Ms. Walker. The vote was unanimous, 8/0.

NOT HEARD AT THE MARCH 8 HDC MEETING

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: LINEBERGER, GOODWIN

APPLICATION:

HDCMI-2022-00805, 1512-1514 SOUTHWOOD AV (PID: 11908311) - WINDOW/DOOR CHANGES, SITE WORK, SIGNAGE

This application was continued from the January 18, 2023, meeting for the following items:

- 1. Per Standards for Trees, 8.5 numbers 2 and 5, provide information on how the tree is impacting the foundation of the structure that is going to be maintained.*
- 2. Per Standards for Fences and Walls, 8.6-8.7 numbers 11 and 12, provide more information about the re-grading needed and the materials of the proposed landscape/retaining wall.*
- 3. Per Standards for Windows, 4.12 through 4.14, provide information, additional evidence, and documentation that the windows must be replaced and are not damaged beyond repair.*
- 4. Per Standards for Sidewalks and Parking 8.2, number 8. Do not pave up to the foundation, a planting strip approximately 12 to 24 inches wide should be left between the drive and house/building.*
- 5. Per Standards for Materials, 7.16 and Storefronts, 7.15 numbers 1-3, the underside of the canopy can be left metal or wood, whatever the applicant prefers.*
- 6. The metal roofing meets the Standards. It is not incongruous with the type of building and is approved per Standard 7.12 numbers 5 and 6 as it relates to this building type. Regarding other materials, the Commission asks Staff to approve.*

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The parcel contains two structures: a one-story, single-family residential Bungalow constructed c. 1936 and a two-story masonry Commercial structure constructed c. 1958. The Bungalow has Colonial Revival elements such as the 6/1 double-hung windows and decorative triangular vent. The building is wrapped in vinyl siding and trim. The original portions of the Commercial building have a brick exterior, with the rear wrapped in vinyl. A later addition is concrete block. Windows and doors are aluminum. The lot size is approximately 75' x 160'. Adjacent structures 1, 1.5 and 2-story single-family buildings and an industrial building. Demolition was approved with a 365-day delay on March 9, 2022 under application number HDCCDEMO-2021-01111.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is the rehabilitation of the two-story masonry commercial structure. The residential structure is still proposed for demolition to create a driveway access and a parking area.

On the front elevation, all existing openings are proposed to remain. The existing overhead roll-up door will change to a storefront entry. The existing front entry will become a window. All windows are proposed for replacement with fixed glass. The non-historic shutters will be removed. A new metal awning will be installed over the entry, extending over the central window.

On the right elevation, many of the existing window openings will be enlarged and become fixed windows. One window will become an entry door. An existing entry door will become a window. Windows will also be created on the existing concrete addition.

On the rear elevation, new windows will be installed, and the roll-up garage door will be replaced with a storefront system. The vinyl siding will be removed, and the original wood lap siding restored.

The existing roof will be replaced with a new metal roof. The existing coping and fascia will also be removed, and a new metal parapet installed.

Site features include the installation of a concrete patio and 1' tall block retaining wall at the front of the structure, a new access driveway and parking area. The new drive and parking will be screened with landscaping. A 24" Oak tree located at the front left corner of the commercial structure is proposed for removal.

Revised Proposal – April 12, 2023

- Windows updated on left and rear elevations, shown on A3.1 and A3.2.
- Planting strip between sidewalk and building added.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Provide additional information about the 24" Oak tree proposed for removal.
2. Landscape wall; location in front yard and material.
3. Provide additional details about the landscaping and screening to be installed, size/species of trees, number of bushes, etc.
4. Specifications on new windows are needed.
5. Note the plans that the brick is to remain unpainted.
6. Minor revisions may be reviewed by Staff (such as items 3-5 above).

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Chair Parati's invitation to speak either for or against this application.

MOTION: CONTINUED

1st: WHITLOCK 2nd: WOJICK

Mr. Whitlock moved to continue this application per Standards 4.12-4.14 for windows stating that alternates for the window replacements should be presented and to allow the applicant to consider operable windows that would more accurately represent what's being removed.

Mr. Barth made a friendly amendment asking the applicant to re-explore the amount of green space on the front patio area to have additional planting between the building and the paved area so that there is no paving directly to the foundation walls. He also asked the applicant to look at the landscape wall in the front as being a material that is compatible with the historic structure.

The lighting was not reviewed at this time, but the Commission is open to sending that component of the application to Staff if it adheres to our Standards and matches the era of the building.

VOTE: 8/0

**AYES: BARTH, BELL, HAWKINS, PARATI, WALKER,
WHEAT, WHITLOCK, WOJICK**

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR WINDOW/DOOR CHANGES, SITE WORK, SIGNAGE - CONTINUED.

CONSENT AGENDA

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: LINEBERGER, GOODWIN

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI-2023-00254, 1512 THOMAS AV (PID: 08118722) – CHIMNEY REMOVAL/REBUILD

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing building is a one-story Bungalow constructed c. 1930. Architectural features include a hip roof with a small hip roof front dormer, both with exposed rafters, and an engaged full-width front porch supported by simple square columns. The windows are 4/1 double-hung wood, and the front door is a replacement. Exterior material is wood lap siding wrapped in aluminum and a painted brick foundation. There is an exterior chimney located toward the front of

the right elevation. A one-story accessory building is in the rear yard. Lot size measures approximately 50' x 100'. Adjacent buildings are 1 and 1.5-story residential structures.

PROPOSAL:

The existing chimney is in danger of collapse and needs to be removed down to the footing. The applicant is proposing to rebuild the chimney on the exterior to match existing appearance and layout. No internal components will remain (firebox, mantel, hearth). All original, existing brick will be saved, numbered, and re-used in the rebuild. The non-painted side of the brick will be installed facing outward. All rotten structural wood substrate, roofing/flashing around the existing chimney will be replaced to match existing. The HDC Staff mason will oversee the project.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets the Standards for Rehabilitation of Building Elements, Roofs, page 4.5 and Chimneys, page 4.7, and the Secretary of the Interiors Standards numbers 5 and 6.
2. Per 10.4.1 of the Rules for Procedure, Staff recommends Approval of the project for meeting the Standards for Rehabilitation of Building Elements, Chapter 4, and the Secretary of the Interior Standards, and that this item be heard as a Consent Agenda item, with the following Conditions:
 - i. Add detailed dimensions of the chimney to the elevation drawings.
3. If requested by a Commission member, or if an interested party has signed up to speak in opposition, then the HDC shall open the application for a full hearing.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Chair Parati's invitation to speak either for or against this application.

MOTION: APPROVED

1st: BELL 2nd: HAWKINS.

Ms. Bell moved to approve this application because it is not incongruous with the district and meets the Standards for rehabilitation of building elements on roofs in Section 4.5 and chimneys in Section 4.7. It also meets the Secretary of the Interior Standards.

VOTE: 7/1

**AYES: BELL, HAWKINS, PARATI, WALKER,
WHEAT, WHITLOCK, WOJICK**

NAYS: BARTH

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR CHIMNEY REMOVAL/REBUILD - APPROVED.

CONTINUED FROM THE MARCH 8TH MEETING

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: GOODWIN, LINEBERGER

APPLICATION:

HDCRMA-2022-01041, 1900 DILWORTH RD W. (PID: 12108815) – ADDITION/ACCESSORY BUILDING

This application was continued from the March 8, 2023, meeting for the following items:

1. *Restudy the building setback per Standard 6.5, number 1, in particular.*
2. *Restudy the roof pitch based on Standards for roof forms and materials, 6.13, number 3. Provide clarification on the dormer offset, dimensions should be placed on the drawings.*
3. *Provide a tree protection plan based on Chapter 8.5 for trees, number 4.*

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a 2.5 story Colonial Revival building built c. 1923/24. Architectural features include a symmetrical façade with a full-width front porch that wraps around the left elevation supported by round columns. The central entry has a transom and is flanked by large triple windows. The hip roof has a decorative dentil eave. The front elevation roof also has a pair of small pedimented gable dormers. There is a decorative side entrance framed by pedimented frontispiece. Windows are 8/1 double-hung wood, and the building exterior is unpainted brick. The lot size measures approximately 66' x 190' x 82' x 193'. Adjacent structures are a mixture of 1, 1.5, 2, and 2.5-story residential buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is for the addition of a rear covered porch and a new accessory building. The new accessory building will be accessed via the alley at the rear of the property. The new covered porch will measure approximately 14' x 28'. Details and materials will match existing including the round columns on top of brick pedestals to match the front porch. Height to align with front porch height. A standing seam metal roof will be used due to the shallow pitch needed to avoid second level windows. A new, unpainted brick fireplace/chimney is proposed on the side elevation, facing E. Worthington Avenue. The porch floor will be ashlar blue stone.

The new accessory structure will be placed over an existing concrete parking pad. The building footprint will measure approximately 24' x 30' and will be approximately 23'-10 ¼" in height, as measured from grade to ridge. Materials include wood lap siding with mitered corners, single-bay wood garage doors, double-hung wood windows in a 6/1 pattern to match the primary structure. The existing mature vegetation along E. Worthington Avenue will be protected during construction. Construction access will be via the alley. Post-construction the rear yard will be 42.3% impermeable.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Chair Parati's invitation to speak either for or against this application.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The garage foundation is close to the 36" Oak tree, is it possible to construct a floating foundation along the side closest to the tree?
2. Confirm new brick/mortar will match existing and will not be painted.
3. Submit permit-ready drawings to Staff that accurately depict all design details of the project.
4. Minor changes may be approved by Staff.

MOTION: APPROVE

1st: HAWKINS 2nd: BARTH

Ms. Hawkins moved to approve this application based on the Design Standards for accessory buildings in Section 8.10. Per Section 8.5 on trees, the applicant is to construct a floating foundation to protect the 36-inch Oak tree. Additionally, where the trees need to be replanted, one large mature canopy tree should be replanted for each tree that is removed. The replanted trees should be two-to-three-inch caliper per Standard 8.5.

Mr. Barth made a friendly amendment, a replanting of a tree one for one and to work with Staff on where those go.

Ms. Walker made a friendly amendment, there is a two to three inch caliper requirement for a replanted tree.

VOTE: 8/0

**AYES: BARTH, BELL, HAWKINS, PARATI, WALKER,
WHEAT, WHITLOCK, WOJICK**

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION/ACCESSORY BUILDING - APPROVED.

NEW CASE

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: GOODWIN, LINEBERGER

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI-2022-01156, 621 BERKELEY AV (PID: 12305706) – ADDITION TO EXISTING DETACHED ACCESSORY STRUCTURE

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing building is a 1.5-story structure with Tudor elements constructed c. 2004. Architectural features include a masonry exterior with an arched front entry. Dormers have lap siding and corner boards. A one-vehicle accessory structure is located at the left rear of the lot. A rear screen porch addition was approved at the Staff level under COA# HDCADMRM-2022-01087. Lot size measures approximately 62' x 145'. Adjacent structures are 1, 1.5 and 2-story residential buildings and a park.

PROPOSAL:

The project is a second-level addition to an existing accessory structure in the rear yard. Existing building height is approximately 17'-4 ¼" from grade to ridge and the addition will increase the height to 23'-0 ¾". According to the Zoutewelle survey the height of the primary building, as measured from grade to ridge is approximately 28.7' on the driveway side. The existing building footprint measures approximately 19'-11" x 17'-3". The building footprint will be widened to the interior of the lot by approximately 4'-9" x 22'-8" to accommodate a new entry and access stair. Proposed materials are noted as new cementitious siding, wood double-hung windows with Simulated True Divided Lights (STDL), metal roofing over the entry, and brick water table foundation. Details about the garage doors are not provided. The concrete drive footprint will also be expanded. Post-construction rear yard impervious area will be approximately 48%.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. A site cross section showing the proposed accessory building addition as compared to the existing primary structure.
2. Provide setbacks on site plan. Confirmation that the existing building meets zoning setback requirements.
3. Coplanar two-story walls on right elevation and coplanar dormer on the left side elevation.
4. What are the dimensions of the existing siding?
5. Windows
 - a. Detail with correct mullion trim dimensions needed.
 - b. Size and locations on yard elevation (right elevation)
 - c. Lack of fenestration on rear and right elevations.

- d. Provide specifications for the new windows
- 6. Provide details about proposed siding including manufacturer, dimensions, etc.
- 7. Provide specifications for the new garage door. New door should be two separate doors or have trim details to appear authentically separate.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Chair Parati’s invitation to speak either for or against this application.

MOTION: CONTINUED

1st: WOJICK 2nd: HAWKINS

Ms. Wojick moved to continue this project based on the requirements for accessory structures in Standard 8.10, number 3, stating that new designs should be compatible with the style and character of the primary historic building. The Commission needs more details on styling and materials for the garage door. The Commission would like to address the new construction elements per Standard 6.8 for massing and complexity of form, especially 6.8 numbers 1 and 2 addressing consistency of surrounding context for one and a half story structures. This includes not permitting coplanar dormers. Ms. Wojick also referenced Section 6.13, numbers 2, 3, and 1 on roof forms noting the language on the roof pitches of surrounding homes and, specifically about dormers, that gables should have appropriate pitches. Ms. Wojick also included Standard 6.15, number 1, (a) through (d) on fenestration. The Commission would like to request the applicant to provide a cross section showing the elevation of the existing structure from grade and the proposed structure’s height.

Ms. Parati made a friendly amendment add Standard 8.10, number 3.

Mr. Barth made a friendly amendment to add Standard 6.11 for directional expression.

VOTE: 8/0

**AYES: BARTH, BELL, HAWKINS, PARATI, WALKER,
WHEAT, WHITLOCK, WOJICK**

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION TO EXISTING DETACHED ACCESSORY STRUCTURE - CONTINUED.

CONTINUED FROM THE MARCH 8TH MEETING

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: GOODWIN, LINEBERGER

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI-2022-01006, 500 E. PARK AV (PID: 12308501) – ACCESSORY BUILDING CHANGES

This application was continued from the March 8, 2023, meeting for the following items:

1. *Continue this application for the applicant to thoroughly review pages 2.3 and 2.4 of the Standards for submittal, which means providing the scaled dimension drawings that accurately depicts the plan and details of the design.*
2. *The porch is not reviewed at this time*

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing 2 ½-story American Foursquare building was constructed c. 1920. The building has a three-bay symmetrical façade with a Pyramidal roof with a small hip roof dormer on the front elevation. Architectural features including a full width hip roof front porch supported by square columns on square brick piers, with a brick balustraded side “deck”; one-story rear ell; one-story side wing; and 18/1 and 12/1 double-hung wood windows. Exterior materials include shingle siding and a painted brick foundation. The lot size is approximately 75’ x 140’. Adjacent structures are 1, 1.5 and 2-story residential buildings and 1-story institutional buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is for changes to an existing accessory structure. The garage doors will be removed. Two sets of paired windows will be installed, and new siding toothed in to match existing. The new windows will be double-hung wood with Simulated True Divided Light (STDL) in a 12/1 pattern to match existing. A new exterior entry door will be installed on the elevation facing Lyndhurst Avenue.

The applicant is also requesting the expansion of the front porch roof to connect to a side roof on the right elevation. The front porch roof extension portion of the application is incomplete and cannot be heard by the Commission until additional information is received including, but not limited to, elevation drawings (front and left) showing how the roof will be supported, how it will tie into the existing roof, etc., a beam/column detail, roof plan, photos showing all existing conditions of the front porch; information about all materials including foundation, floor, ceiling, columns, roof trim, etc.

Revised Proposal

- Front and right elevation drawings provided for the garage.
- Photos of window trim provided.
- Photos of front porch ceiling, trim, beam, and columns provided.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Chair Parati’s invitation to speak either for or against this application.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Front Porch:
 - a. Provide additional information and details about how the two existing roofs will be connected to the new roof.
 - b. What will happen to the tops of the windows? Will the beam wrap around the left side?
 - c. Provide a porch section drawing from foundation to roof, showing the column/beam alignment with dimensions and materials noted.
 - d. Provide photos of the porch floor. It is not clear from the drawings and information provided if the porch floor currently wraps around the left side of the house.
 - e. Downspouts should be relocated to the side (not front) of the new porch column.
2. Accessory building changes:
 - a. What is the entry door material? Provide a cut sheet and specification for the new door.
 - b. Window trim dimensions needed. The window mullion needs to be wider than the exterior trim.
 - c. Window spec sheets call for a “Factory Mull”, which has not been approved by the Commission because mullion design and dimensions will be too narrow.
3. Minor changes may be approved by Staff.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

The existing building is a 1-story Bungalow constructed c. 1920. Architectural features include a hip roof with an engaged full width front porch that wraps around the left elevation supported by square Ionic columns. Exterior materials include wood shingle siding with a skirt detail below the windows comprised of wood lap siding, and a painted brick foundation. Details include wood brackets and 6/1 double-hung wood windows. The lot size is approximately 50' x 140'. Adjacent structures are 1 and 1.5-story residential buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is a rear addition that is lower than the primary ridge and does not expand the building footprint. The height to the original ridge provided is shown as 22'-9 1/2" from finished floor, which does not include the foundation to grade height. Height of the new addition is not provided, only the height to the second level ceiling. The addition will be a cross-gable addition with a rear facing gable and shed roof dormers. The cross-gables will have wood shake siding to match the primary siding on the original house. The rear facing gable and shed roof dormers are proposed to have wood lap siding with a 6" exposure. Window, roof, and all other trim proposed to be traditional wood to match existing. New roof will be slate to match existing. Two skylights are proposed for installation on the right elevation roof. The tree shown on the site plan was originally proposed for removal; however, the attached arborist report indicates the tree will be limbed and retained instead.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Height. Provide height as measured from grade to ridge for both the original ridge height, and the proposed addition height.
2. Rear Gable:
 - a. Relationship between paired window and gable trim.
 - b. The rear gable is the only gable on the building that will have wood lap siding. Recommend wood shake siding in the rear gable to match the other 5 gables on the house.
3. Skylights. Confirm installation will not require changes to the roof structure to install.
4. Minor changes may be approved by Staff.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Chair Parati's invitation to speak either for or against this application.

MOTION: CONTINUED

1st: HAWKINS 2nd: BELL

Ms. Hawkins moved to continue this application to restudy the roof forms and addition per Standard 6.20 and to also look at the illustrations on 6.22, 6.23, 6.24, as well as Standard 6.13, numbers 1 through 3 for roof forms and Standard 6.11 for directional expression. The applicant is to add a street view of the skylights per Standard 6.13 number 7.

VOTE: 8/0

**AYES: BARTH, BELL, HAWKINS, PARATI, WALKER,
WHEAT, WHITLOCK, WOJICK**

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION AND TREE REMOVAL - CONTINUED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: GOODWIN, LINEBERGER

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI-2022-01154, 1706 DILWORTH RD E (PID: 12311111) - PORCH CHANGES

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a 1-story brick Tudor Revival cottage constructed c. 1939. Architectural features include an asymmetrical façade with a large prominent front chimney, steeply pitched gables, arched front entry with original door and fanlight, and a catslide roof over a (now infilled) side porch. The exterior is unpainted brick with a decorative basketweave water table detail and windows are 6/6 double-hung wood. The lot size is approximately 77.5' x 165' x 40' x 147'. Adjacent structures are 1, 1.5, and 2-story residential buildings and an institutional structure.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is the installation of a new front porch covered by a trellis and fenestration changes to the previously infilled side porch. The front porch will be approximately 2' in height with a brick foundation and a floor of broken pieces of quarry tiles. The trellis will be 8'x8' wood posts and steel beams faced with a wood beam. The side porch infill will be removed and replaced with metal clad single light doors and fixed door panels.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Front Porch:
 - a. What are the footprint dimensions of the front porch?
 - b. How will the new front porch impact the front chimney?
 - c. Trellis columns need additional cap and base details.
 - d. Provide a photo of the proposed quarry tile floor.
 - e. Will the trellis attach to the building or just the new front porch?

2. Side Porch Changes:
 - a. Front elevation, door design appears incongruous with the 6/6 design of the original fenestration.
 - b. Right elevation fenestration and trim design.
 - c. On the rear elevation, will the steps be enlarged? Is a handrail needed?
 - d. Proposed fenestration is metal clad.
 - e. Trim details needed.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Chair Parati's invitation to speak either for or against this application.

MOTION: CONTINUED

1st: WOJICK 2nd: BARTH

Ms. Wojick moved to continue this project because the design elements are incongruous. She added that she liked the idea of the space being more of a porch again, but this proposed plan was not congruous. The Commission would like a restudy of the porch conversion and the new porch pergola design based on Standard 4.8, numbers 3 and 5 for porches noting the reference images on 4.9 images. They also referenced Standard 4.14, number 14 and 18, and The Secretary of Interior Standards Section 2.5. Ms. Wojick added that the applicant should review Standard 4.10, number 2 and Standard 4.10 number 4 directing property owners to not reduce or enlarge entrances or door openings

Mr. Barth made a friendly amendment, stating that the windows need to complement the structure with regard to style and proportion per Standard 6.15, number 1 (a) through (d).

Ms. Parati made a friendly amendment about Standard 6.15, number 2 which states: "Respect the traditional design of the openings...openings are generally recessed on a masonry building, while the element is surrounded by raised trim on a frame building. New openings that are flush with the rest of the wall are not allowed."

Ms. Walker made a friendly amendment referencing Standard 4.10, number 2, which prohibits the use of stock doors with details that provide a false sense of historical accuracy.

VOTE: 8/0

**AYES: BARTH, BELL, HAWKINS, PARATI, WALKER,
WHEAT, WHITLOCK, WOJICK**

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR PORCH CHANGES - CONTINUED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: GOODWIN, LINEBERGER

APPLICATION:

HDCRMIA-2022-01148, 1921 RUSSELL AV (PID: 07507919) – REPLACEMENT OF FRONT DOOR & WINDOW AND REMOVAL OF WINDOWS - AFTER THE FACT

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a Mid-Century Modern 1-story ranch with wood lap siding c. 1953. Architectural features include a gable roof at the right end of the house with front and truncated rear gable bump-outs at the left end of the house. It has a front and a rear stoop. The lot size is approximately 51' x 160' x 52' x 161'. Adjacent structures are 1-story residential buildings. Staff approved the removal of vinyl siding (after-the-fact), window restoration (after-the-fact) and site work under COA # HDCADMRM-2022-00569; the front door and window changes were excluded in this COA.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is the replacement of the original front door and changes to the original triple window located to the right of the front door. The replacement front door will be a new wood door with a 3-over-3 window. The two original fixed windows on either side of the double hung window have been removed and the openings framed in and covered with wood lap siding. The project is considered an After-the-Fact review, with the Commission reviewing the project on its merits according to the Design Standards as if work has not yet occurred.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The removal of the original front door and the stock replacement door is incongruous with Design Standards 1 and 2 for Front Doors and Entrances (page 4.10).
2. The removal of original windows is incongruous with Design Standards 1, 2 and 3 for Windows (pages 4.12-4.14).
3. The change in configuration of the original front window and openings is incongruous with Design Standards 6 and 13 for Windows, (page 4.12-4.14) call for avoiding changes to the existing openings on primary elevations.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Chair Parati's invitation to speak either for or against this application.

MOTION: DENIED

1st: BELL 2nd: BARTH

Ms. Bell moved to deny this application based on Standards of Interior's Standards listed in Section 2.5 as well as Sections 4.12, 4.13, and 4.14 for windows. The applicant is asked to work with Staff on selecting and approving the final materials. The original window size and framing needs to be reestablished to change from what is currently a single

window back to a six-panel window. The door should be the same as the original materials. The door should return to the original construction. The applicant can work with Staff on all material and finalization selections.

VOTE: 8/0

**AYES: BARTH, BELL, HAWKINS, PARATI, WALKER,
WHEAT, WHITLOCK, WOJICK**

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR REPLACEMENT OF FRONT DOOR & WINDOW AND REMOVAL OF WINDOWS - AFTER THE FACT - DENIED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: GOODWIN, LINEBERGER

APPLICATION:

HDCRMAA-2023-00061, 700 TEMPLETON AV (PID: 12305619) – BRICK STAINING – AFTER THE FACT

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The original structure was a one-story brick house constructed in 1936. A 365-day stay of demolition was placed on the property on July 13, 2016 (Case# HDC 2016-123). At the October 12, 2016, meeting a proposal for a new single-family house and detached garage was heard by the HDC and denied (Case# HDC 2016-254). The HDC approved Case# HDC 2016-274 at the March 8, 2017, meeting for a new single-family house. The lot size is approximately 50'x148'. Adjacent residential structures are a mix of 1 ½ and 2 story structures. A multi-family development is located behind the house.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is the staining of the brick on the new construction of the primary structure. Under the approval of case# HDC 2016-274 the original brick exterior was to remain, and new brick added to match existing. The original brick was completely removed and new brick/mortar that does not match the original historic brick was installed. Neither the removal of the brick nor the new brick was approved by either the Commission or Staff. The proposed solution for bringing the color of the new brick into compliance is staining the brick for a more traditional brick color. The project is considered an After-the-Fact review, with the Commission reviewing the project on its merits according to the Design standards as if work has not yet occurred.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The Standards (New Construction for Residential Buildings, Materials page 6.18, #1 and #6) call for traditional brick/mortar colors that are unpainted for brick used in new construction.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Chair Parati's invitation to speak either for or against this application.

MOTION: DENIED

1st: BARTH 2nd: BELL

Mr. Barth moved to deny this application for alternative brick as it does not meet our Standards for building materials, 6.18, number 6 and the Secretary of Interior Standards 2.5 and Section 5.5 and 5.6. The Commission is requiring the applicant come back with a new application referencing the previously approved submittal. The brick should match the original in color, size, texture, and scale.

VOTE: 8/0

**AYES: BARTH, BELL, HAWKINS, PARATI, WALKER,
WHEAT, WHITLOCK, WOJICK**

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR BRICK STAINING – AFTER THE FACT – DENIED.

APPLICATION:

HDCRMIA 2022-01157, 317 WESTWOOD AV (PID: 11908715) -TREE REMOVAL -- AFTER THE FACT

The applicant deferred this application.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: GOODWIN, LINEBERGER

RECUSED: WALKER

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI-2023-00113, 1119 BELGRAVE PL (PID: 12310303) – TREE REMOVAL & REPLANTING

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a one-story Colonial Revival-style house constructed in 1951. Notable features include a slate roof, engaged front entry, and metal windows. Previously approved projects include a detached garage, sunroom addition on the rear and a small addition on the right elevation. Lot size is irregular and measures approximately 104' x 212'. Adjacent structures are 1, 1.5, and 2-story single-family structures.

PROPOSAL:

This project is for tree removal of one (1) Tulip Poplar tree in the rear yard. The tree is 42" in diameter and approximately 100-feet in height. A report from a Certified Arborist is attached. The applicant has provided a detailed site plan showing the location of all existing trees on site and the proposed locations for two (2) trees to be planted, a Japanese Maple and a Red Maple. A review of the tree removal request from City of Charlotte Urban Forestry Staff is included.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The Commission will determine if the proposed tree removal meets the Standards.
2. If approved for removal, then typically a new large maturing, hardwood canopy tree 2-3" caliper is required to be planted as a replacement to regrow the canopy.
3. Minor changes may be approved by Staff, including the tree replanting plan.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Chair Parati's invitation to speak either for or against this application.

MOTION: APPROVED

1st: HAWKINS **2nd:** WHEAT

Ms. Hawkins moved to approve this application based on Standard 8.5, number 2 on trees.

VOTE: 6/1

AYES: BARTH, BELL, HAWKINS,

NAYS: PARATI

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR TREE REMOVAL & REPLANTING - APPROVED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:

ABSENT: GOODWIN, LINEBERGER

RETURN: WALKER

APPLICATION:

HDCCMIA-2023-00075, 1513-1515 S MINT ST (PID: 11908315, 11908316) – SIGNAGE – AFTER THE FACT

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structures at 1513 and 1515 S. Mint Street were built in 1927 and 1947, respectively. Both buildings are 1-story brick commercial structures with storefronts along S. Mint Street. The lot size for 1513 S. Mint St is approximately 50' x 147' and the lot size for 1515 S. Mint St. is approximately 50' x 147'. Adjacent structures are 1-story commercial buildings. The Commission previously approved fenestration changes, painted brick, restoration, parking area improvements, and the demolition of a non-historic rear addition on 1513 S. Mint St in September 2019 (COA # HDCCMA-2019-00367); signage, murals, lighting, and awnings were not included. Modifications were made to the original 2019 plans thus the Commission reviewed fenestration changes, restoration, and site work, including lighting and awnings in October 2020 (COA # HDCCMI-2020-00324); a signage and murals were not included. Staff approved a rear addition on 1513 S Mint St (COA # HDCADMC-2022-00191) in April 2022.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is the installation of one (1) wall sign on the front of 1513 S. Mint St. and two (2) wall signs on the right elevation of 1515 S. Mint St. The wall sign on the front of 1513 S. Mint St. projects less than six inches from the wall and is approximately 4.75 square feet in area. The two (2) signs are proposed for the right-side of 1515 S. Mint St. are a combined square footage of approximately 18 square feet. All signage has already been installed as well as a temporary sign at the entrance to the parking on the right side of the building. The project is considered an After-the-Fact review, with the Commission reviewing the project on its merits according to the Design Standards as if work has not yet occurred.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. One sign will be installed on the front elevation of 1513 S. Mint St. and will be less than eight square feet in area.
2. Two signs will be installed on the right elevation of 1515 S. Mint St. exceeds ten square feet.
3. All proposed signs are either one or two sided.
4. All temporary signs should be removed.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Chair Parati's invitation to speak either for or against this application.

MOTION: CONTINUED

1st: BARTH 2nd: HAWKINS

Mr. Barth moved to continue this application, requesting the applicant to restudy the signage for each individual tenant as a holistic approach. The Commission is also requesting the applicant to place signage near the main point of entry for

each tenant. The applicant should consider the other sign restrictions referenced in Appendix A for Sign Standards and Regulations for urban districts, specifically items A.2, number 2, and A.1, number 13.

VOTE: 8/0

**AYES: BARTH, BELL, HAWKINS, PARATI, WALKER
WHEAT, WHITLOCK, WOJICK**

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION FOR SIGNAGE – AFTER THE FACT – CONTINUED.

Due to time constraints the following cases will be heard on May 10, 2023, meeting.

HDCRMA-2023-00074, 1500 Dilworth Rd

HDCMA-2023-00115, 1921 Charlotte Dr

HDCRDEMO-2023-00079, 1209 Myrtle Av

Ms. Wheat moved to approve the March 8, 2023, Minutes. Mr. Barth seconded it, and the vote was unanimous, 8/0.

With no further business to discuss, Chair Parati adjourned the meeting at 7:11 pm.